



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,155	12/05/2003	Prasad V. Chaturvedula	CT2777A	1027
23914	7590	03/15/2006	EXAMINER	
LOUIS J. WILLE BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY PATENT DEPARTMENT P O BOX 4000 PRINCETON, NJ 08543-4000			BALASUBRAMANIAN, VENKATARAMAN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/729,155

Applicant(s)

CHATURVEDULA ET AL.

Examiner

Venkataraman Balasubramanian

Art Unit

1624

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-31,37 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,6-31,37 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/9/04, 10/5/05, 2/21/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Election/Restrictions***

Applicant's election of Group III, claims 1-46, wherein A=CH, namely piperidine compound, composition and method of use, along with election of species of Example 47, in paper dated 12/21/2005, is acknowledged. Cancellation of non-elected claims 3-5, 32-36 and 40-46 is also acknowledged. Since applicants have not pointed out any error in the restriction requirement, the election is deemed as without traverse.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claims 1, 2, 6-31, 37 and 39 are now pending.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

References cited in the Information Disclosure Statements, filed on 3/9/2004, 10/5/2005 and 02/21/2006, are made of record.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 6-31, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Following reasons apply. Any

Art Unit: 1624

claim not specifically rejected is rejected as being dependent on a rejected claim and shares the same indefiniteness.

1. Claim 1 and its dependent claims 2, 6-31, 37 and 39, are indefinite as the definition of X and Y is vague and unclear. It is recited that R<sup>1</sup> and R<sup>2</sup> together form a ring X which is further substituted with Y which is clear as to the embodiment. However, it is stated that X and Y are optionally interrupted with Z which has several choices. Since X and Y are given several heteroaromatic ring choices, it is not clear how such an interrupted group be inserted in these rings. Note also "and" after first choice. Also the last choice of X and Y is confusing for two reasons. First of all, the attachment of Y to X, as recited before these choices appears to be one carbon and not nitrogen. Secondly, how X and Y can form a spiro ring with the heterocyclic ring choices is unclear. See claims 20, 23 and 27 for the same.
2. Claim 29 is indefinite as it is not clear what is intended by " as provided in the first embodiment of the first aspect" See last line of the claim.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 2, 6-31, 37 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for making pharmaceutically acceptable salts does not reasonably provide enablement for making solvate. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most

Art Unit: 1624

nearly connected, to make and use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. The following apply.

In evaluating the enablement question, several factors are to be considered. Note *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 and *Ex parte Forman*, 230 USPQ 546. The factors include: 1) The nature of the invention, 2) the state of the prior art, 3) the predictability or lack thereof in the art, 4) the amount of direction or guidance present, 5) the presence or absence of working examples, 6) the breadth of the claims, and 7) the quantity of experimentation needed.

**1. The nature of the invention and the state of the prior art:**

The invention is drawn to compound of formula I, or a pharmaceutically acceptable salt or solvate thereof. Specification is not adequately enabled as to how to make hydrate of compounds of formula (I) Specification has no example of hydrate of the instant compounds. Specification on page 5 recites solvate thereof but there is no enabling of such compounds.

The compound of formula I embrace piperidine compounds substituted with various variable groups.

Even a cursory calculation of the number of compounds embraced in the instant formula (I) based on the generic definition of alkyl, aryl heteroaryl, heterocycl, substituted aryl, heteroaryl, arylalkoxy, arylalkylthio etc would result in millions of compounds. This is of course not the accurate number and the true number of compounds would far exceed this number of compounds. Thus the genus embraced in the claim 1 is too large and there is no teaching of any hydrate of this large genus.

Search in the pertinent art, including water as solvent resulted in a pertinent reference, which is indicative of unpredictability of hydrate formation in general. The state of the art is that is not predictable whether solvates or hydrates will form or what their composition will be. In the language of the physical chemist, a hydrate of organic molecule is an interstitial solid solution. This phrase is defined in the second paragraph on page 358 of West (Solid State Chemistry). The solvent molecule is a species introduced into the crystal and no part of the organic host molecule is left out or replaced. In the first paragraph on page 365, West (Solid State Chemistry) says, "it is not usually possible to predict whether solid solutions will form, or if they do form what is the compositional extent". Thus, in the absence of experimentation one cannot predict if a particular solvent will solvate any particular crystal. One cannot predict the stoichiometry of the formed solvate, i.e. if one, two, or a half a molecule of solvent added per molecule of host. Compared with polymorphs, there is an additional degree of freedom to hydrates, which means a different solvent or even the moisture of the air that might change the stable region of the hydrate. In the instant case of hydrate a similar reasoning therefore apply. Water is a solvent and hence it is held that a pertinent detail of West, which relates to solvates, is also applicable to hydrate

In addition, an additional search resulted in Vippagunta et al., Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews 48: 3-26, 2001, which clearly states that formation of hydrates in unpredictable. See entire document especially page 18, right column section 3.4. Note Vippagunta et al., states "Each solid compound responds uniquely to the possible

Art Unit: 1624

formation of solvates or hydrates and hence generalizations cannot be made for series of related compounds".

**2. The predictability or lack thereof in the art:**

Hence, the solvate and hydrate as applied to the above-mentioned compounds claimed by the applicant are not art-recognized compounds and hence there should be adequate enabling disclosure in the specification with working example(s).

**3. The amount of direction or guidance present:**

Examples illustrated in the experimental section are limited to making the compounds not related to solvates and hydrates. There is no example of a solvate or hydrate of instant compound. Two seventy eight hundred and compounds were shown in the examples of the specification, pages 71-336, each of which has come in contact with water and other solvent but there is no showing that instant compounds formed solvates or hydrates. Hence it is clear that merely bring the compound with solvent or water does not result in solvate or hydrate and additional direction or guidance is needed to make them Specification has no such direction or guidance.

**4. The presence or absence of working examples:**

There is no working example of any solvate or hydrate formed. The claims are drawn to hydrate, yet the numerous examples presented all failed to produce a solvate or hydrate or even hydrate. These cannot be simply willed into existence. As was stated in *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190 "The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds with the required connectivity. However ... there, is no evidence that such

Art Unit: 1624

compounds exist... the examples of the '881 patent do not produce the postulated compounds... there is ...' no evidence that such compounds even exist." The same circumstance appears to be true here. There is no evidence that hydrates of these compounds actually exists; if they did, they would have formed. Hence, there should be showing supporting that solvates and hydrates of these compounds exist and therefore can be made.

**5. The breadth of the claims & the quantity of experimentation needed:**

Specication has no support, as noted above, for compounds generically embraced in the claim 1 would lead to desired solvate and hydrate of the compound of formula I. As noted above, the genus embraces over million compounds and hence the breadth of the claim is broad. The quantity of experimentation needed would be an undue burden on skilled art in the chemical art since there is inadequate guidance given to the skilled artisan for the many reasons stated above. Even with the undue burden of experimentation, there is no guarantee that one would get the product of desired hydrate of compound of formula I embraced in the instant claims in view of the pertinent reference teachings.

MPEP 2164.01(a) states, "A conclusion of lack of enablement means that, based on the evidence regarding each of the above factors, the specification, at the time the application was filed, would not have taught one skilled in the art how to make and/or use the full scope of the claimed invention without undue experimentation. In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557,1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993)." That conclusion is



Art Unit: 1624

clearly justified here. Thus, undue experimentation will be required to make Applicants' invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 6, 8, 13, 18, 20, 28-31 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Itoh et al., US 5,932,737.

Itoh et al. teaches several peptide compounds for treating NO-mediated diseases which include instant compounds. See column, formula 1 and note the definition of various variable groups. Especially note when R<sup>2</sup> of T is piperidinyl group further substituted with heterocyclic, compounds taught by Kath et al. includes instant compounds. See entire document. Particularly see column 33-490 for list of compounds made. Especially see column 275-276, seventh compound and column 278-279, third compound.

Itoh et al. differs from the instant claims in exemplifying only monocyclic heterocycle on the piperidine ring while instant claims require a fused bicyclic ring. However, Itoh et al. teaches equivalency of those compounds taught in column 33-490 with those generically recited in column 1-5. See R<sup>2</sup> definition and the definition of heterocyclic group which includes bicyclic rings.

Thus it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make compounds using the teachings of Itoh et al including fused heterocycle substituted piperidine and expect resulting compounds to possess the uses taught by the art in view of the equivalency teaching outline above.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication from the examiner should be addressed to Venkataraman Balasubramanian (Bala) whose telephone number is (571) 272-0662. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday from

Art Unit: 1624

8.00 AM to 6.00 PM. The Supervisory Patent Examiner (SPE) of the art unit 1624 is James O. Wilson, whose telephone number is (571) 272-0661

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (571) 273-8300. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAG. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-2 17-9197 (toll-free).

  
Venkataraman Balasubramanian

3/10/2006